



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,831	12/27/2000	Stephen Heisig	YOR920000705US1	6296

7590

05/20/2004

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,831

Applicant(s)

HEISIG ET AL.

Examiner

VAN H NGUYEN

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Maffeis** (U.S. 6,721,779).

4. As to claim 1, Maffeis teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a computer system (*e.g., a computer system; col. 1, lines 55-58*) coupled to work stations operated by remote clients (*e.g., clients; col. 1, lines 55-58*) comprising:

an object server container within the system, the container having a plurality of server objects relating to specific, respective servers (*e.g., see fig. 1 and associated text*); and

means for providing access to the server objects from the remote clients, the means including a protocol adapter framework for supporting an appropriate arbitrary protocol between the clients and the server objects (*e.g., see abstract and col.3, lines 5-47*).

Art Unit: 2126

While teaching a protocol adapter, client requests, arbitrary protocols, and an object server, Maffeis does not explicitly teach the protocol adapter being responsive to client requests in the arbitrary protocol to *derive* therefrom method requests on an object residing within an object server.

Maffeis, however, discloses “*Pluggable protocol adapters allow the message proxy to send and receive messages to and from message clients using arbitrary wireless protocols (col.3, lines 5-47).*”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied the teaching of Maffeis for “the protocol adapter being responsive to client requests in the arbitrary protocol to *derive* therefrom method requests on an object residing within an object server” in order to provide additional features on top of the existing transport protocol. Examples of such additional features include data encryption and guaranteed delivery of messages.

5. As to claim 4, Maffeis teaches the protocol adapter framework includes HTTP adapter (*e.g., HTTP; col.3, lines 5-8; and col.4, line 30*).

6. Claims 2, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Maffeis** in view of **Aharoni et al.** (U.S.6,014,694).

7. As to claim 2, Maffeis does teach a server computer and HTTP (*figs. 1 and 2*). A web server is inherent to the system of Maffeis. However, Maffeis does not explicitly teach a video server.

Aharoni teaches a video server (*e.g., video server; figs.2 and 15*).

Art Unit: 2126

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aharoni and Maffeis because Aharoni's teaching would have provided the capability for transporting video from a video source over a network channel to a video client.

8. As to claim 3, a web browser is inherent to the system of Maffeis. However, Maffeis does not explicitly teach a video player.

Aharoni teaches a video player (*video player; col.17, lines 40-59*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aharoni and Maffeis because Aharoni's teaching would have provided the capability for displaying video in a video client.

9. As to claim 5, Maffeis does not explicitly teach a video protocol adapter.

Aharoni teaches a video protocol adapter (*e.g., the video client 220 is adapted...directly from the most suitable server; col.19, lines 9-41*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aharoni and Maffeis because Aharoni's teaching would have provided the capability for efficiently browsing video from the video server and viewing video on the video client.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on March 8, 2004 have been fully considered, but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Madrane (U.S. 6573907) teaches "network distribution and management of interactive video and multi-media containers."

- Nelson et al. (U.S. 6427153) teaches "System and method for implementing Java-based software network management objects."

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(x). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(x).

13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

Art Unit: 2126

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971.


The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VHN


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100